

REMARKS

Applicant gratefully acknowledges and thanks the Examiner for the helpful and courteous comments during the Interview with the Examiner on May 17, 2006.

Claims 1-3, 9-11, 13-16, 28 and 30 have been amended. Claims 39-41 and 43 have been canceled. Claims 1-4, 9-18, 28, 30-32 and 36-38 are now pending in the present application. Applicant reserves the right to pursue the original and any other claims in this and other applications.

Claims 1-4, 10-18, 28, 30-32, 36-41 and 43 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Harlow in view of Brennan. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 recites a telecommunication device capable of "identifying a dialed telephone number associated with [a] call, . . . [and] using the dialed telephone number to retrieve from a storage medium a first telephone number, a second telephone number and at least one user preference." Claim 1 further recites "using the at least one retrieved user preference to dial the first telephone number to form a first communication path between said processor and the first telephone number and dial the second telephone number to form a second different communication path between said processor and the second telephone number substantially simultaneously, wherein said processor holds the call for a predetermined time until it is determined that a user has answered a device associated with one of the first and second telephone numbers, . . . [and] authenticates the answered device before forming a completed circuit connection between the calling device and the answered device by connecting the calling device to the formed communication path connected to the answered device." Applicant respectfully submits that the cited combination fails to disclose, teach or suggest the claimed invention.

Applicant respectfully submits that the architecture of Brennan relates to a single communication path switch call, meaning that when Brennan transfers a call to a remote device, the circuit from the calling party to the called party is connected and complete. Although, in Brennan the calling party cannot communicate with the called party until the system verifies that the caller is on the line, for purposes of the connection, the Brennan connection is complete. Combining Harlow with Brennan does not change this result.

As acknowledged by the Office Action and as discussed during the Examiner Interview, contrary to the cited combination, the claimed invention employs multi-communication paths that do not connect the inbound call immediately to the remote devices. (Office Action at 6). The claimed invention holds the call in a wireless connect unit (i.e., processor) until the call has been authenticated. Thus, the calling party in the claimed invention is not connected to the called party (i.e., remote device) until the claimed invention electronically switches the calls together to form a single circuit. In other words, the circuit from the calling party to the called party is not connected or complete. Therefore, the combination of Harlow and Brennan fail to render obvious a telecommunication device that "holds [a] call for a predetermined time until it is determined that a user has answered a device associated with one of the first and second telephone numbers, . . . [and] authenticates the answered device before forming a completed circuit connection between the calling device and the answered device by connecting the calling device to the formed communication path connected to the answered device."

Hence, the inventions of Harlow, Brennan and the present application are patentably distinct. Moreover, the inventions of Harlow and Brennan are incapable of requiring an authentication before connecting the answered call. As described above, Harlow and Brennan require that the complete connection be made initially and cannot

be formed at a later time similar to the claimed invention. This is another reason why the claimed invention is allowable over the cited combination.

Thus, the cited references, whether considered alone or in combination, fail to disclose, teach or suggest the limitations of the claim 1 invention and would not render claim 1 obvious. Claims 2-4 and 10-18 depend from claim 1 and are allowable along with claim 1.

Claim 28 recites a method of providing telecommunications to a user of a communication network comprising the steps of "forming a first communication path between [a] first communication device and [a] connect unit by placing a first call to the first communication device; forming a second communication path between [a] second communication device and the connect unit by placing a second call to the second communication device." According to claim 28, "said acts of placing the first and second calls [occur] substantially simultaneously." The method also comprises "determining if the first communication device answered the first call or if the second communication device answered the second call; and if the first or second call where answered and authenticated, routing the received communication to the authenticated answering device by connecting the received communication to the formed communication path associated with the answering device." As described above, the cited combination fails to disclose, teach or suggest such limitations. Applicant respectfully submits that Harlow and Brennan, even when combined, do not teach or suggest a telecommunications method that holds a communication until an answering communication device has been authenticated, and then connecting the communication to the communication device.

Claim 30 recites a method of providing telecommunications to a user of a communication network comprising the steps of "routing, using the retrieved at least

one user preference, [a] communication to at least two destination communication numbers substantially simultaneously, wherein the at least two destination communication numbers are selected from the group including the retrieved first and second communication numbers and a voice mailbox number, and wherein the act of routing the communication comprises forming a first communication path to the first communication device number and a second communication path to the second communication device number.” Claim 30 further comprises “determining if one of the destination communication numbers has been answered; and if it has been determined that one of the destination communication numbers has been answered, requesting information from a user before routing the held communication through the formed communication path associated with the answered destination communication number.” For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicant submits that claim 30 is allowable over Harlow and Brennan. Claims 31, 32 and 36-38 depend from claim 30 and are allowable along with claim 30.

For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicant respectfully submits that Harlow and Brennan fail to teach or suggest the limitations of the claimed inventions. Nor would it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the cited references to achieve the claimed invention. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn and that claims 1-4, 10-18, 28, 30-32 and 36-38 be allowed.

Claim 9 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Harlow in view of Brennan and further in view of Swan. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 9 depends from claim 1, and thus recites a telecommunication device capable of “identifying a dialed telephone number associated with [a] call, . . . [and]

using the dialed telephone number to retrieve from a storage medium a first telephone number, a second telephone number and at least one user preference,” and “using the at least one retrieved user preference to dial the first telephone number to form a first communication path between said processor and the first telephone number and dial the second telephone number to form a second different communication path between said processor and the second telephone number substantially simultaneously, wherein said processor holds the call for a predetermined time until it is determined that a user has answered a device associated with one of the first and second telephone numbers, . . . [and] authenticates the answered device before forming a completed circuit connection between the calling device and the answered device by connecting the calling device to the formed communication path connected to the answered device.” As demonstrated above, Harlow and Brennan do not teach or suggest such a telecommunication device. Swan is cited by the Office Action as teaching a caller of the telephone call was prompted with a menu of call destination options and the call is routed to at least one destination telephone number in accordance with an option selected by the caller. (Office Action at 5).

Even assuming this statement to be correct, Swan does not teach or suggest a telecommunication device capable of “identifying a dialed telephone number associated with [a] call, . . . [and] using the dialed telephone number to retrieve from a storage medium a first telephone number, a second telephone number and at least one user preference,” and “using the at least one retrieved user preference to dial the first telephone number to form a first communication path between said processor and the first telephone number and dial the second telephone number to form a second different communication path between said processor and the second telephone number substantially simultaneously, wherein said processor holds the call for a predetermined time until it is determined that a user has answered a device associated

with one of the first and second telephone numbers, . . . [and] authenticates the answered device before forming a completed circuit connection between the calling device and the answered device by connecting the calling device to the formed communication path connected to the answered device.” Therefore, even adding the teachings of Swan to the Harlow and Brennan combination, the cited references fail to disclose, teach or suggest all limitations of the claim 9 invention. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn and the claim allowed.

In view of the above amendment, Applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Dated: June 6, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Gianni Minutoli

Registration No.: 41,198

DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO MORIN &

OSHINSKY LLP

2101 L Street NW

Washington, DC 20037-1526

(202) 785-9700

Attorney for Applicant